

**From:** Gregg Williams  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/28/02 2:41pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice:

I am writing regarding the Microsoft settlement as someone with more-than-average credentials to have an opinion. From 1979 to 1988, I was Senior Editor of BYTE magazine, the personal computer industry's first major magazine. From 1988 to 1998, I worked for Apple Computer, where I wrote to third-party developers about the advantages of the Mac OS platform over the Microsoft Windows platform. In both jobs, it was my responsibility to be aware of Microsoft's acts and how they affected the computer industry.

With that introduction, let me add my voice to that of the many people and companies who believe that the Department of Justice's proposed settlement is not in the public interest. The final judgment after a trial should punish the guilty, discourage similar offenses in the future, and if possible, repair the damage done. The proposed settlement actually causes harm, in several ways: It does not provide the remedy that it was meant to; it implicitly encourages the reoccurrence of similar wrongdoing; and it does not address significant larger issues that need attention.

The final judgment for this case is important in more than just its immediate context; it also has important consequences in our increasingly digital world. Our country (and the world) has most of its eggs in one basket--Microsoft's--and this is dangerous. Just as any natural ecology is endangered when its diversity is lessened and one species dominates, so is our digital ecology endangered by Microsoft's overwhelming market share and its stifling of competition. As just one example, observe the devastating effects of the denial-of-service attacks against amazon.com and other online businesses a few years ago. They would not have been as effective if a significant fraction of the country's Internet users had not been using Microsoft's email programs. Also, all hacker attacks are tied to the vulnerability of a specific product; if there were, say, three email programs and three browser programs in common usage (instead of Microsoft's Outlook and Internet Explorer), such attacks would injure fewer users, spread more slowly, and consume less Internet bandwidth than is the case today.

For the above reasons, this judgment is doubly important, and the currently proposed judgment is doubly dangerous. I believe that a good final judgment must both prevent further wrongdoing and counteract Microsoft's dominance in current and future markets. Any attempt to regulate Microsoft's conduct MUST be given the resources to succeed, and its workings MUST be visible to the public. Without these two provisions, Microsoft will evade lawful punishment again, just as it did in the mid-1990s.

Finally, Microsoft should be made aware that it has no say in selecting or

refusing its punishment. Nor should the court be pressured into compromise for fear that punishing Microsoft will damage this nation's economy. In fact, it is Microsoft's actions that are causing long-term damage, and any judgment that leads to competition, innovation, and meaningful customer choice will help repair that damage our economy.

I support the efforts of the states that are pressing for a more comprehensive punishment for Microsoft's illegal acts. As an informed and active citizen, I expect nothing less.

I submit my opinion to the Department of Justice with great respect, out of a deep concern for this nation's long-term technological and economic health.

Gregg Williams, greggw@telocity.com

NOTE: This was written using voice-recognition software.  
Please excuse any errors that I missed during editing,  
and ask if something doesn't make sense.